



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The supremacy of the English-speaking inhabitants was established by the election of an equal number of members from the Upper and Lower provinces, so that in case of necessity the English minority in Lower Canada could unite with their brethren in the Upper. Lord Durham was strongly in favor of a federal instead of a legislative union, but was forced by circumstances to alter his plans. His wisdom, however, was justified by the failure of the legislative union and the adoption of the federal in 1866, but it is doubtful whether this result would have taken place without the fifteen years of preliminary training.

For long the currently received opinion as to the authorship of the *Report* was that "Wakefield thought it, Buller wrote it, Durham signed it," which rested on statements in the *Greville Memoirs*, J. S. Mill's *Autobiography*, and Martineau's *History of England during the Thirty Years' Peace*. Dr. Garnett has, however, dissected it with great skill (*English Historical Review*, XVII. 268), and his conclusions as to the relative share of each in its composition is generally concurred in by Mr. Bradshaw. After going over the evidence very carefully it seems impossible to avoid the conclusion that the first part was dictated by Lord Durham, probably to Wakefield, and that the last was the work of the same hand. That Buller furnished the copy for the second part and Wakefield for the fourth seems probable, but it is evident that they were carefully revised and amended by Lord Durham. Whatever may be the claim that others have had to its preparation, it is in the recommendations of the *Report* that its strength lies, and no one now questions Lord Durham's entire responsibility for them. Mr. Bradshaw's volume is a complete vindication of Lord Durham's statesmanship, while he has not failed to point out the irritability and want of restraint which prevented him from attaining that eminence which his talents seemed to justify.

The book contains a large but not well-chosen bibliography and an excellent index. Altogether Mr. Bradshaw has done a good piece of work, the general excellence of which covers a multitude of sins in the shape of minor errors, readily made by one who is not a native of the country.

JAMES BAIN, JR.

*Zur jüngsten deutschen Vergangenheit.* Von KARL LAMPRECHT, Professor der Geschichte an der Universität Leipzig. Zweiter Ergänzungsband, erste Hälfte. (Freiburg im Breisgau: Verlag von Hermann Heyfelder. 1903. Pp. xvii, 520.)

THE purpose of the first part of the second volume of Lamprecht's *Zur jüngsten deutschen Vergangenheit* is to describe and interpret *das Wirtschafts- und Socialleben Deutschlands* in the nineteenth century. Introductory to the main body of the book the author gives us a hundred pages of "connecting links" between the latter portion of the *Deutsche Geschichte* and the present work. These hundred pages, we are told, may be omitted by those who are familiar with the earlier volumes or who are acquainted with the main points of the recent history

controversy in Germany. The next one hundred and twenty pages are devoted to *das Wirtschaftsleben*, while the remaining two hundred and ninety-one pages are given up to the discussion of *die sociale Entwicklung*.

To Lamprecht the ruling idea of recent times is *die freie Unternehmung*, individual initiative, or perhaps individualism. Throughout medieval and a large part of modern times *die Gebundenheit*, restricted action of the individual, subjection of one sort or another, in social as well as economic activity, bound men rigidly to certain rules, to tradition or superstition. Under this Europe languished for more than a thousand years, its population remaining almost stationary, its civilization benefiting only a favored few. The almost incomprehensible changes of the latter decades of the eighteenth and the first decades of the nineteenth centuries prepared the way slowly for the freedom of movement, of occupation, of thought of the modern man. This modern man has at last come: he has multiplied the wants of men twenty-fold (p. 153); he has reduced the size of the earth to one-tenth of what it was before; he measures time by the second, not by the day; he has made the earth yield up fuel for all the needs of the race; he has taught it to support a population of from three to five times as many souls as formerly; his enterprise knows no limitation and his invention no bounds. To-day it is honorable to work, whereas formerly idleness or rapine or war were the sole ennobling occupations of men. Under the inspiration of this new, this miraculous man, iron has taken the place of clumsy wood, chemistry has succeeded alchemy, and electricity has been made to light men's houses, transport their burdens, cook their meals.

But this intense and unbridled individualism has brought us face to face with problems of vast import. The makers of our modern conditions, the "free undertakers," have made themselves the masters of the great masses of the population, they have inaugurated the rule of the ablest, the most masterful. In doing this they have forced a social revolution which touches the life of every man. The outlining of this social readjustment — *die sociale Entwicklung* — composes the latter portion of the volume before us.

The social changes due to the operation of the principle of freedom of vocation and movement and to the discoveries and inventions of recent times Lamprecht describes in an admirable way in the six closing chapters of his new volume. Men no longer follow a calling for a livelihood, but they work for the very love of it, for excitement, and this is especially true of the *Geistesleben*. Complete absorption in one's work, self-annihilation in order to produce something which astounds, to turn out a "masterpiece every year," to conquer — that seems to be the rule. As an example of this the present status and aim of journalism are cited. The old-fashioned, culture-seeking scholar and artist have disappeared.

In the third and fourth chapters of this section of the book we are shown how the older forms of industry, commerce, and agriculture have disappeared, and how new forms have been developed: the "hand-worker" with his small establishment and a few helpers has been forced

to the wall, the old-time house-to-house peddler no longer tramps the public highway. Instead there have sprung up gigantic establishments which absorb all the activities in their particular branches, which have the world for a market, and which send out their own agents in all directions. There is thus no place for the middleman; but two classes are left, the employer and the employed, the absolute master and the dependent day-laborer.

The same course of things is traced in the chapter dealing with agriculture. Central and south Germany have become industrial; the peasants emigrated to America in great numbers, and the Poles and Russians took their places. By 1880 the eastern provinces of Prussia were largely in the hands of the new-comers. The government sought to remedy the evil (pp. 396-405) by purchasing large areas of land from the greater landlords and then selling on easy terms to peasant farmers. Much good seemed to be done before 1895 in this direction. Still the migration to the industrial centers continued, and thousands sought homes in the United States.

Another problem had been in the way for years: foreign (particularly American) competition in agriculture kept the price of farm products low with the tendency to go still lower. In 1879 the new German Empire undertook to remedy these evils by a protective tariff and by the payment of bounties on sugar and other agricultural products; but the tendency to create great estates owned and controlled by capitalists at once became manifest, and the small farmer was scarcely any better off than before. Despite all efforts to the contrary, the population continued to divide into two sharply defined classes with antagonistic interests and aims. Besides this the cities continued to grow enormously, and the population almost doubled in the forty years after 1860. The principle of unrestrained competition instead of bringing relief brought only the conviction that the vast body of the people were bound once for all to the few strong and masterly minds—the captains of industry and commerce, the “self made man” becoming rarer as the years went by.

Gradually the so-called “fourth estate” came into full realization of its existence, and universal education taught it still better to know its powers and how to exercise them. This class combined first in the form of labor-unions, which rapidly merged into a great political party. Meanwhile the capitalists united their strength, first in companies, then in trusts, and finally in still greater trusts which almost absolutely controlled both the purchasing and the selling prices of a large number of commodities. So the end of the nineteenth century brought the two great classes of society face to face in sharpest opposition and armed as for a conflict. Both were trained, determined, and powerful, both were essential to modern civilization.

To the author this state of things cannot long endure. Some bounds must be set each party. And already a beginning has been made by the capitalist class in controlling production and the market; already the principle of free competition and universal opportunity has run its

course and a second age of *Gebundenheit* is at its door. It will be the state this time which will step in and regulate and control, giving to each man his due and directing what the vocations of individuals shall be. Is not this the teaching of Karl Marx? Indeed our author is outspoken in approval of many of the great socialist's views. There is thus not so much that is new in the volume before us; its method, its combinations, as well as its deductions, are what mark the work as one of great importance. The question as to whether this is history need not concern those who believe that history has to do with all the thoughts and acts of men.

Lamprecht's next volume will treat of the political history of Germany in recent times, and until that appears the historian must in a measure suspend his final judgment of the work as a whole. One thing must be said, these new volumes prove conclusively the breadth and depth of their author's culture as well as the thoroughness of his investigations.

WILLIAM E. DODD.

*History of Philosophy.* By William Turner, S.T.D. (Boston and London, Ginn and Co., 1903, pp. x, 674.) The author of this history candidly admits that it is written from a particular standpoint, that of Roman Catholicism (preface, v), but throughout his work he shows also a desire to be both comprehensive and fair-minded, and he lays claim to the empirical or *a posteriori* method. His book, too, is confessedly no more than a text-book, giving in outline the systems of philosophy from the earliest times down even to the present day and making some effort besides to indicate the historical relations of the different systems to each other; yet it is really both more exhaustive and in spite of its exaggeration of the importance of Scholasticism often more scholarly than many more pretentious works; and its estimates of the philosophers, even of those of quite recent times, have the marks of study and appreciation. In fact Dr. Turner's *History of Philosophy* certainly deserves a place among all those works in philosophy, of which Protestants have written many, that are, I will not say theologically apologetic, but in spite of their common conceit of the *a posteriori* method thoroughly imbued with the idea that philosophy, though "determining to a large extent the literary, artistic, political, and industrial life of the world" (p. 2), has really no vital influence on the religious life, "the religious view and the rationalistic view of every question" being essentially distinct (p. 215). Perhaps of such books the real value is more in the history which they make than in the history which they recount, since they invariably start controversy, and even their own immediate patrons are never wholly protected against bringing the religious view and the rationalistic view into more intimate relationship.

Naturally Dr. Turner feels his keenest interest in Scholasticism, and it must be conceded that his reproach (preface, i) of those who either "dismiss the Scholastic Period with a paragraph" or "treat it from the point of view of German Transcendentalism" is by no means undeserved. True, with nearly a third of his book devoted to the Scholastic philosophy,